

1959

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

12887

revenue losses amounting to as much as \$7 million a day. But, Mr. President, that will be only the beginning. We must also consider the effects on other industries of a prolonged strike in the steel industry. For instance, one railroad recently laid off from work 5,000 of its employees, because it was no longer hauling the iron ore which it had been hauling prior to the strike. Such adverse economic repercussions—like the ripples caused by a stone which is dropped into a pool of water—will spread across the economy, far beyond the immediate clash of the interests directly concerned.

As I stated on yesterday, in connection with this issue, I take only one side; namely, the side of the public. In its overall effect, the steel strike will be costly to the workers, the consumers, our industries, and also, possibly, our defense. In addition, the strike may well have serious inflationary effects on the economy.

Naturally, Mr. President, the bargaining rights of both labor and management must be preserved—but not to the detriment of the rights of the public.

In this period, particularly, as I said on yesterday—this period of change and of threat—we cannot sit idly by and say that these are normal times and that we are going to follow normal procedures, many of which are outmoded today.

So, Mr. President, in view of the high costs of such a strike in terms of money, living standards, defense, and other factors, I believe that the Federal Government, through the Congress and the executive branch, should take a "new look" at this situation, and should do something about it. The purpose would be to try to find proper ways and means by which agreements could be reached, particularly in industries which affect the national interest, to solve this problem.

I repeat that this situation involves not only the 5,000 steel industry strikers; it also involves the other 177 million Americans. The strike involves not only the steel industry, but also a great many other industries. The economic life of our Nation is involved.

Mr. President, let us consider who is most interested in a prompt solution of the steel strike: Not industry, not even labor; those who are most interested are the great majority of the 177 million Americans who remain outside of either group that is immediately involved in this strike situation.

So I repeat, as I said yesterday, that Congress has a job to do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the call of the roll be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## VISIT OF VICE PRESIDENT NIXON TO MOSCOW—CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, Vice President Nixon has just arrived to open the U.S. Fair in Moscow, and I am informed by press reports that Premier Khrushchev did not meet his plane; instead, the Premier was busy denouncing "Captive Nations Week" once again in another part of Moscow. I do not believe the Vice President will be affected by this attack, nor will the American people. Premier Khrushchev has an easy way to meet the issue if he means what he says that "the only enslaved peoples are in the capitalist countries."

If Mr. Khrushchev wishes to answer the challenge of Captive Nations Week, then let him essay to prove to the world—and to himself, if he dares—that the years of Communist indoctrination have truly convinced the great masses of people in the nations of central and southeastern Europe that communism is their salvation. We in the West have no fear of such a free expression. Khrushchev can answer this challenge only by allowing free elections under U.N. auspices for self-determination in the captive nations.

On July 17, in response to Senate Joint Resolution 111 passed by the Congress, President Eisenhower issued a proclamation designating the third week of July as "Captive Nations Week." The proclamation called upon the people of the United States to "observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities" and "to study the plight of the Soviet-dominated nations and to recommit themselves to the support of the just aspirations of the peoples of those captive nations."

The adoption of such a resolution by the Congress and its proclamation by the President is a natural consequence of the deep and historic concern of the American people for those peoples deprived of their national independence and personal liberty. This traditional concern for the oppressed extends to the over 100 million peoples of the captive nations of Central and Southeastern Europe.

The Soviet Union has chosen to take umbrage at this observance. Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev has denounced the campaign of prayer being conducted in the United States for the liberation of the subjugated peoples of Europe. Apparently, a sore spot in the Communist conscience has been struck. The most serious setbacks the world Communist enterprise has suffered were on the occasion of the bloody and tragic suppression of the Hungarian revolution in 1956 and the Tibetan revolt this year. In both instances the uprising of the people—the workers, the farmers, the citizens—of these nations struck at the very heart of the Communist argument that they represent a new order of economic and political freedom for all. Laid bare, communism is seen to be imperialism by force—but with better propaganda technicians.

The Soviets, by their reaction, reveal that what they fear is not only our material strength but our spiritual resources; the Communists can duplicate our material gains by using a bigger whip, but they do not dare to give the freedoms enjoyed by every citizen of our land.

Mr. President, yesterday the representatives of the captive nations in the United States came to the Senate Office Building and very graciously presented scrolls to the Senator from Illinois, Mr. DOUGLAS, myself, and Representative McCORMACK, the majority leader in the other body, and made some very important addresses on that occasion.

I ask unanimous consent that there be included as a part of my remarks in the Record the addresses by Mr. Korbonski and Mr. Halychyn on that occasion, as well as the response of the Senator from Illinois, Mr. DOUGLAS, and myself.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

ADDRESS BY STEFAN KORBONSKI, CHAIRMAN OF THE ASSEMBLY OF CAPTIVE EUROPEAN NATIONS, AT CEREMONY HONORING SENATOR PAUL H. DOUGLAS, SENATOR JACOB K. JAVITS, AND REPRESENTATIVE JOHN W. McCORMACK, WASHINGTON, D.C., JULY 22, 1959

Senator DOUGLAS, Senator JAVITS, Representative McCORMACK, it is a great privilege for me to convey to you, and through you, to the Congress of the United States of America, the grateful thanks of the Assembly of Captive European Nations for the joint congressional resolution authorizing and requesting the President of this great Nation to issue a proclamation designating the third week of July 1959 as Captive Nations Week, to be observed each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world.

The joint resolution unanimously adopted by the Senate, on July 6, and by the House of Representatives, on July 9, is an act of historical significance to the silenced peoples of Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and Rumania for whom we are the spokesmen in the free world, as it is for all the other peoples, in Europe and Asia, which have fallen victims to the most ruthless imperialism known in history; Communist imperialism.

It is significant, first of all, because it was unanimously adopted by the most independent and respected legislative body in the world which can look back proudly to almost two centuries of uninterrupted service to the American people and to the cause of human freedom. It is significant because it not only gives solemn expression to the serious concern, so often and so consistently expressed in the Halls of the U.S. Congress, for the fate of the captive peoples, but also officially pledges support for the just aspirations of these peoples to freedom and independence. And it is significant because it was issued at this particular time when, in preparation of further expansionist moves, the Soviet rulers would like to consolidate their rule over their Eastern European springboard by securing the sanction of the United States and her allies for their ill-gotten conquests, and when the Western Powers are often advised by the timid and the faltering to embark on what they call the realistic course of recognizing the accomplished facts which, as they put it, the West has no power to change.

There is not the slightest doubt in my mind that if free to express themselves, the people of our countries would overwhelmingly hail the basic propositions of the joint congressional resolution. They know, alas, too well, something about Soviet imperialism and are, therefore, in a position to judge how right Congress was in exposing the mockery of the Soviet advocacy of co-existence. They draw much satisfaction from the knowledge that the U.S. Congress is aware of the fact that they regard the United States as the "citadel of human freedom" and look to it for "leadership in bringing about their liberation and independence." And they are gratified that Congress has so forcefully pointed to the truth, sometimes forgotten in the free world, that their "desire for liberation and independence constitutes a powerful deterrent to war," while their freedom is an essential prerequisite to a just and lasting peace.

The captive peoples will be forever indebted to the Congress of the United States for their demonstration of solidarity and support at a time when Soviet propaganda and sometimes the very march of events seem to conspire in trying to undermine their faith in the West and their hopes in a better tomorrow—that is the very foundations of their spirit of resistance.

A clear purpose is the beginning of any effective action. The Congress and the President of the United States have now clearly, forcefully, and solemnly declared their purpose in regard to the captive nations. Would it be too much to hope that political action will now follow and that we can look forward from now on to a persistent resort to all peaceful means to achieve this purpose?

In raising the unresolved issue of freedom and independence of our captive nations at all international conferences concerned with a European settlement; as well as before the United Nations, we are convinced that the Western Powers would undertake the right action not only from the moral but also from the political viewpoint. We are, of course, under no illusion that such action would bring immediate, practical results. We believe, however, that in the longer run western political and diplomatic pressures and the pressures our peoples are constantly exerting from within—represent a most powerful combination that may wear down even the most stubborn adversary. It is in this spirit that we have been advocating a new approach to the problem of peace-making in Europe. Instead of putting forward proposals of limited scope and seemingly acceptable to the Soviets, the approach which failed to pass the test of Geneva, wouldn't it be more rewarding for the West to proclaim clearly, to reiterate unremittingly and to pursue persistently an overall European peace plan based on the principle of self-determination for all European nations? And, from a mere tactical viewpoint, wouldn't a persistent call for the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Eastern Europe (to be followed by free elections) be the most effective western answer to the Soviet challenge both on Berlin and in the underdeveloped and non-self-governing nations?

We trust that our views which (we have good reasons to believe) are also the views of the most competent experts on Soviet conduct: the people in the captive nations, will eventually gain ground in the free world. And we are quite sanguine that in our efforts to promote them we shall be able to count on the understanding help of the many friends our nations have in the U.S. Congress.

Senator DOUGLAS, Senator JAVITS, Representative MCCORMACK, let me conclude with an expression of profound gratitude to you for the initiative you have taken in introducing the joint resolution and for all your efforts to see it through. Thank you from

the bottom of our hearts. The success of your initiative is another illustration of what leadership and steadfastness can achieve even against the staggering obstacles on a congressional homestretch. As a token of deep gratitude and respect the Assembly of Captive European Nations, together with the American Friends of the Captive Nations and the Conference of Americans of Central-Eastern European Descent, beg you to accept these scrolls. May our peoples themselves soon be in a position to honor you, as they know best, and show you their affection, gratitude, and respect for what you have been doing for so many years on their behalf.

STATEMENT BY MR. DMYTRO HALYCHYN, CHAIRMAN OF THE CONFERENCE OF AMERICANS OF CENTRAL AND EASTERN EUROPEAN DESCENT (CACEED) AT THE MEETING WITH CONGRESSIONAL SPONSORS OF THE CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK RESOLUTION, ON JULY 22, 1959, IN WASHINGTON, D.C.

It is my pleasure and distinct honor to appear here personally and in the name of the Conference of Americans of Central and Eastern European Descent (CACEED) thank the sponsors of the joint congressional resolution for their great insight and belief in the cause of the enslaved nations of Europe and Asia, which they demonstrated by sponsoring the said resolution. I also thank the President of the United States who issued a proclamation of July 17, 1959, designating this week as the Captive Nations Week and who signed a congressional resolution providing for annual observance of the week.

This resolution, which has now become Public Law 8690, constitutes a great and significant event in our relations with the enslaved nations languishing in the tyrannical slavery of Communist Russia, because it clearly and definitely states that the U.S. Government and the American people as a whole have not forgotten these victims of Soviet Russian despotism and slavery.

Our organization, encompassing the many millions of American citizens of Albanian, Bulgarian, Czechoslovak, Hungarian, Estonian, Latvian, Lithuanian, Polish, Rumanian, and Ukrainian descent has been a staunch and intrepid advocate of an enlightened U.S. policy of liberation in deep conviction that only a wholehearted support of the enslaved nations in their struggle against Soviet Russian imperialism and domination can prevent Communist Russia from her further conquests and aggressions in the world.

This is why we believe that the passage of the resolution will greatly enhance the prestige and power of the United States, as it will remind both the free and the enslaved worlds that it still is a champion of freedom and independence of all the enslaved and persecuted, and a bastion and ultimate hope of mankind as a whole.

It is with a sense of deep gratitude that our organization pledges its support to you and to our Government in fighting the Communist encroachments everywhere, as it firmly believes that only a bold stand against Communist Russia would enable us not only to maintain our precious freedom and security, but eventually it would help the 23 enslaved nations, enumerated in the joint congressional resolution, to regain their own freedom and independence to which they, as God's creations, are fully entitled.

STATEMENTS BY SENATORS DOUGLAS AND JAVITS

Prime Minister Nikita Khrushchev yesterday complained to Western newsmen in Warsaw against the campaign of prayer that is being conducted in this country for the liberation of peoples subjugated by communism that is being conducted in this

country as part of the observance of Captive Nations Week. His reported reply to this action was that the only enslaved peoples are in the capitalist countries.

The fact that Khrushchev was moved to reply so promptly and so angrily is the best possible proof that, in thus assuring the captive peoples that we will continue to work by all peaceful means for their ultimate liberation, we have touched on Khrushchev's sorest and most vulnerable spot.

Not even the cows of Kazakhstan will be impressed by Khrushchev's claim that this is freedom in the Communist world and that the only enslaved peoples are in the capitalist countries. What is slavery, after all? A man is a slave when he is not his own master. When a man cannot vote for a government of his choice, when he does not have the protection of civilized laws, when he is not free to travel or to change employment, when he is completely at the mercy of an all-powerful state, when he cannot speak his mind for fear of persecution—then he is certainly not his own master. It is significant that the very same issue of the New York Times which reported Mr. Khrushchev's speech carried the news that of the 23 members of the editorial board of the learned Soviet publication, the Botanical Journal (Botanichesky Zhurnal), all but two have recently been dismissed because their views on heredity failed to conform to the internationally ridiculed but officially sponsored views of Academician Trofim D. Lysenko. What more devastating commentary could there be on the abasement and enslavement of the human mind which is a condition of Communist power?

Khrushchev's statement identifying freedom with slavery and slavery with freedom is as preposterous as it sounds. If the peoples in the satellite nations are truly free, as Khrushchev claims, why does he not consent to prove his point by arranging for free elections in all of the captive countries, under the supervision of the United Nations? If he did so, he could restore respect for the pledged word of the Soviet regime, remove the most important source of tension in Europe, and pave the way for a general settlement that would assure security to both the Soviet Union and Western Europe. This is the crux of the issue being discussed so fruitlessly right now in Geneva.

Until such time as Mr. Khrushchev consents to such free elections, we, for our part, shall do our utmost to expose Soviet rule in the captive free world, to fortify them in their spirit of resistance, and to work for their ultimate liberation by every peaceful means.

The churches and synagogues of America, by offering prayers for the liberation of the captive peoples, have simply acted in harmony with their fundamental belief in the God-given rights of man. We have nothing to apologize for if these prayers have offended Mr. Khrushchev. On the contrary, we can assure him that his reaction will stimulate the American people of all religions, to pray with all the more fervor that the freedom which is theirs will someday, in the not too distant future, be shared by their brothers in all countries.

Mr. JAVITS subsequently said: Mr. President, I thought Senators might be interested in hearing Khrushchev's words today in Moscow, in the light of what I have said about how the Communists have become very irritated about the fact that we have declared a Captive Nations Week.

This comes from an American source, and is a direct translation of Mr. Khrushchev's speech this morning coming over the wires from London. It is as follows:

The oppressed peoples, the working people of the capitalist countries, are striving

959

with increasing persistence to get rid of the rule of the monopolies, the lack of rights and fierce exploitation. Being aware of all this, the monopolists are giving as it were an anti-Soviet, anti-Socialist inoculation of the peoples of their countries and are taking such irrational decisions as the holding of all sorts of "week of aid to enslaved peoples," using in this black deed all the rables which the peoples of the socialist countries have thrown out of their countries. They have thus added fuel to the flames at the time of the arrival of U.S. Vice President Nixon in the Soviet Union—"the enslaved country of communism."

Mr. President, to this I think I should say we are delighted Mr. Khrushchev is so irritated, and we think Mr. Nixon can very well handle that in stride. We hope very much that the fact that we have at last touched the sensitive nerve of the Communists will help Mr. Nixon in his mission, in which we certainly all wish him the best of luck.

#### NEW YORK TO MOSCOW FLYING RECORD

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I was called shortly after 8 o'clock this morning and learned that another Seattle produced Boeing 707 has made aviation history.

Now an American plane holds the New York to Moscow record, having cut more than an hour from the flying time of the Russian built plane which carried Soviet First Deputy Premier Frol Kozlov to Russia earlier this month.

I ask unanimous consent that the United Press International account of this great achievement be printed in the body of the Record.

There being no objection, the account was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Moscow.—America's biggest commercial jetliner today streaked nonstop from New York to Moscow in the record time of 8 hours and 45 minutes.

The flight of the intercontinental version of the Boeing 707 knocked 63 minutes off the flying time of the Russian TU-114 prop-jet that set the previous New York-Moscow record when Soviet First Deputy Premier Frol Kozlov returned to Russia earlier this month.

The new record was set by a Pan American World Airways jetliner, under charter to the U.S. State Department carrying 96 persons, most of them American newsmen assigned to cover Vice President Nixon's 11-day tour of Russia.

The record-breaking flight began last night at 10:35 p.m. e.d.t. when the Boeing 707 took off from Idlewild International Airport in New York.

The Pan American jetliner arrived over Moscow at 7:20 a.m. e.d.t., circled for 7 minutes before getting landing clearance, and 2 minutes later, at 7:29 a.m. e.d.t., was on the ground.

The newsmen left New York about 90 minutes after Nixon left Friendship, Md., aboard an Air Force UC-137 Jet Transport—the smaller and slower version of the Boeing 707. They beat Nixon into Moscow.

The press plane flew nonstop from New York. The Nixon plane refueled at Reykjavik, Iceland.

#### REQUIREMENT OF LOYALTY OATH UNDER NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I merely want to say that I am surprised—

perhaps shocked is a better word. Here in the Senate of the United States is offered a bill to do what? To remove the requirement of making an oath of loyalty to the United States. What does that loyalty oath say? It says this:

I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the United States of America and will support and defend the Constitution and the laws of the United States against all its enemies, foreign and domestic.

What possibly can be wrong with requiring any young man or woman to take such an oath before he or she receives the benefits provided under the National Defense Education Act—I repeat, the National Defense Education Act?

What possibly can be wrong with requiring these young people to sign an affidavit that they do not believe in, are not members of, and do not support any organization that teaches or believes in the overthrow of the U.S. Government by force or any illegal methods?

Mr. President, it seems to me that there is nothing wrong with asking these young people to repeat such oaths and sign such affidavits. It seems to me, Mr. President, that it is only right that they should do so.

In fact, I cannot understand why these young people—yes, and their august teachers also—would not deem it a privilege to take this oath. I would think they would feel some allegiance to the Government from which they seek loans to complete their education.

It has been argued here that we should not single out these young people when we do not ask others receiving Government benefits to take an oath.

To this, I say they should feel honored to be so singled out. I find nothing wrong with asking all persons receiving any kind of U.S. benefits to pledge allegiance to the principles for which America stands. In a similar way I have been opposed to giving aid to Communist countries.

We have also been told that such oaths should be repealed because they do not keep out subversives.

This may be true, but these oaths serve another purpose, Mr. President—a purpose which needs more serving and which can never receive too much service. And that purpose is to remind these young Americans and all Americans that we all owe allegiance to our country and that we are privileged to be American citizens. In short these oaths serve the purpose of patriotism.

That is why I am shocked at this bill. We need more patriotism in this country, not less. We need, as we have never needed before, young people who will realize what America means, what is important about its history and its principles. And we need young people who are not ashamed to stand up and say proudly that they pledge their allegiance to the United States.

For these reasons, Mr. President, I hope the provision of the act, adopted in good faith by the 85th Congress, will remain in effect, and, if anything, will be bolstered by the 86th Congress, and not weakened.

I cannot understand why in the Senate of the United States Members of this

body advocate the repeal of that part of the National Defense Education Act which was passed in good faith last year.

As time goes on, as it is going on, and as the months and years pass by, I say to the Members of this body who are advocating the repeal of the loyalty oath that some day their action is going to haunt them. As one U.S. Senator, I want the Record to show I am opposed to such repeal, and I care not what pressures are put on me or anyone else to take this step. I believe any young man or woman in this country who is the product of our great country should deem it a privilege to take such an oath or make such an affidavit.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. ERVIN. The Senator, of course, is aware, as every Member of this body ought to be, that article VI of the Constitution of the United States requires every Senator, every Representative in Congress, every member of any State legislature, and all executive and judicial officers, both of the United States and of all the States, to take an oath or affirmation that they will support the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. BRIDGES. I am.

Mr. ERVIN. The Senator is also aware, is he not, that a person is not even allowed to join the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, or the Air Force, which have been established to defend this country, if he is unwilling to take an oath to support the Constitution of the United States?

Mr. BRIDGES. I am. I want to say to the Senator from North Carolina that I am shocked at what is sought. I venture to say it will come back to hit any Senator who takes the action suggested.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New Hampshire has expired.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes. To the Senator from New Hampshire, I will say I think there is general agreement with what he is talking about. I stated last night I would accept gladly language which would provide for an oath or affirmation to support the Constitution of the United States and a pledge of allegiance. I will also say to the Senator from New Hampshire what we are talking about is that a student should not be required to supply an affidavit. A Senator is not so required, nor is one who is in the Army or Navy required to present an affidavit that he is not a member of an organization seeking to overthrow the Government of the United States. That is quite different from the requirement of a pledge of allegiance.

Does the Senate recognize that distinction?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes, but, in effect, it is the same thing.

Mr. KENNEDY. I think there is quite a difference between requiring someone to take an oath or a pledge of allegiance to the U.S. Government and requiring a particular group to file an affidavit that they are not members of the Communist Party or Communist front organizations. We require such an affidavit of employees of the Government or officers of the

Army or Navy. We are talking about students. It is not proposed that all recipients of Government aid shall do so, but only needy students, and that is what I object to.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I should like to make one observation. When any person takes an oath to support the Constitution of the United States and to defend it against all its enemies, both foreign and domestic, as every officeholder in the United States is required to do, as every member of the Armed Forces is required to do, and as every person who attempts to register to vote in any of the States is required to do, he impliedly and as a part of the oath states, in essence, that he does not believe in overthrowing the Government by force and violence.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, is the Senate still in the morning hour?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is still in the morning hour.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, may I have the attention of my good friend from North Carolina.

I think the position of those of us who favor the pending bill is based to a large extent on the fact that we do not think the students or the educational institutions of this country should be treated any differently from anybody else in connection with oaths and affidavits.

If my good friend the Senator from North Carolina would be willing to submit an amendment to the bill which would provide that every farmer who gets a loan on his tobacco crop, every member of an REA cooperative, and every mortgage banker who gets Government insurance under the FHA or VA programs, would also be required to take oath of allegiance, I for one would have no objection. My point of view is that this is an attempt to make second class citizens out of the brains of America. It is an unjust smear against people who are as loyal to the United States of America as is any tobacco farmer in my State or in the State of the Senator from North Carolina.

If the Senate is willing to retain this oath requirement for anybody who gets a loan under the education bill, then we ought to be willing to apply it to anybody under any kind of loan program of the U.S. Government. We should not single out the brains of the country and try to put them in a category which suggests that some of them may be more disloyal to the Government of the United States than other persons who receive Government loans or grants under the acts of Congress without being asked to take loyalty oaths.

Mr. ERVIN. I suggest nothing of that kind, Mr. President. This is a national defense education act. Why should we be willing to spend the money of the taxpayers to educate people for national defense if those people believe they ought to destroy by force and violence, against the will of our people, the Government which is furnishing the money?

Mr. CLARK. Why should we be willing to spend the money of the Government of the United States to make loans to tobacco farmers who might be dis-

loyal to the Government of the United States?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair wishes to state that the unfinished business has not been laid before the Senate. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

#### REPEAL OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS REQUIRING AFFIDAVITS OF LOY- ALTY AND ALLEGIANCE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Presiding Officer may lay before the Senate the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas? The Chair hears none, and lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 819) to amend the National Defense Education Act of 1959 in order to repeal certain provisions requiring affidavits of loyalty and allegiance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the substitute amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time is to be allocated under the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may suggest the absence of a quorum and that the time necessary to call the roll not be charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I object to that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, Senators will recall that at the conclusion of the discussion yesterday afternoon the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] had suggested a proposal for addition to the amendment which I had offered in the nature of a substitute, and we were discussing, in a colloquy with the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], a revision of the language. As Senators know, my original amendment in the nature of a substitute eliminated both the oath disclaiming Communist membership and the oath of allegiance and provided in lieu thereof effective protective mechanism for preventing disloyal Americans from participation in the funds available under the National Education Defense Act.

I felt the collegiate groups opposing the oaths would not oppose this traditional method of safeguarding these funds. However, late yesterday Senator KENNEDY agreed to accept the allegiance oath proposed by Senator RUSSELL so I am likewise moving to accept that oath as part of my proposed substitute.

Consequently, today, I have conferred with both the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER]. The Senator from

Arizona is presently detained from the floor of the Senate, since he is addressing the National Press Club luncheon. However, I ask unanimous consent that I may modify my amendment in order to include these revisions in language in my proposed substitute, and I do so on behalf of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] and myself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question. I did not quite understand what the Senator said. My question is this: Does the Senator from South Dakota ask to substitute the language of the Goldwater amendment for the language of his amendment?

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator is correct, as a part of my revision.

Mr. ERVIN. In other words, it is a substitute rather than an addition?

Mr. MUNDT. That is correct; it is actually both.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I ask the Senator from South Dakota, whom I could not hear very well, to tell me whether he is withdrawing his amendment and offering the Goldwater amendment.

Mr. MUNDT. I will explain that, if I may have a few minutes.

What I am doing in the proposed modification of my amendment, is, first, replacing the language which I had suggested about the Attorney General's list, with the language of the Goldwater amendment, which is printed. Then I have added the suggestion of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] about the oath of allegiance, so as to have it all wrapped up in one package.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Are copies of the amendment as sent to the desk available to the Members of the Senate?

Mr. MUNDT. They are available in two pieces. The Goldwater amendment is printed and on the desk, and the Russell proposal is in the RECORD of yesterday where the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] agreed to accept the oath of allegiance and where subsequently I made the same agreement.

Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Dakota to modify his amendment?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the Presiding Officer to have the clerk read the amendment, as the Senator requests that it be modified, because I am not clear as to what we are asked to do. Does the Senator from South Dakota object to having that done?

Mr. MUNDT. Not at all.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment, as it is proposed to be modified, will be stated for the information of the Senate.